arXiv:1702.05933v1 [math.ST] 20 Feb 2017

Qualitative robustness for bootstrap approximations

Katharina Strohriegl,University of Bayreuth
katharina.strohriegl@uni-bayreuth.de

February 21, 2017

Abstract

An important property of statistical estimators is qualitative robustness, that is small changes in the distribution of the data only result in small chances of the distribution of the estimator. Moreover, in practice, the distribution of the data is commonly unknown, therefore bootstrap approximations can be used to approximate the distribution of the estimator. Hence qualitative robustness of the statistical estimator under the bootstrap approximation is a desirable property. Currently most theoretical investigations on qualitative robustness assume independent and identically distributed pairs of random variables. However, in practice this assumption is not fulfilled. Therefore, we examine the qualitative robustness of bootstrap approximations for non-i.i.d. random variables, for example α-mixing and weakly dependent processes. In the i.i.d. case qualitative robustness is ensured via the continuity of the statistical operator, representing the estimator, see Hampel (1971) and Cuevas and Romo (1993). We show, that qualitative robustness of the bootstrap approximation is still ensured under the assumption that the statistical operator is continuous and under an additional assumption on the stochastic process. In particular, we require a convergence condition of the empirical measure of the underlying process, the so called Varadarajan property.

Keywords: stochastic processes, qualitative robustness, bootstrap, α-mixing, weakly dependent
AMS: 60G20, 62G08, 62G09, 62G35

1 Introduction

The overwhelming part of theoretical publications in statistical machine learning was done under the assumption that the data is generated by independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables. However, this assumption is not fulfilled in many practical applications so that non-i.i.d. cases increasingly attract attention in machine learning. An important property of an estimator is robustness. It is well known that many classical estimators are not robust, which means that small changes in the distribution of the data generating process may highly affect the results, see for example Huber (1981), Hampel (1968), Jurečková and Picek (2006) or Maronna et al. (2006) for some books on robust statistics. Qualitative robustness is a continuity property of the estimator and means roughly speaking: small changes in the distribution of the data only lead to small changes in the distribution (i.e. the performance) of the estimator. In this way the following kinds of "small errors" are covered: small errors in all data points (rounding errors) and large errors in only a small fraction of the data points (gross errors, outliers). Qualitative robustness of estimators has been defined originally in Hampel (1968) and Hampel (1971) for

the i.i.d. case and has been generalized to estimators for stochastic processes in various ways, for example, in Papantoni-Kazakos and Gray (1979), Bustos (1980), Cox (1981), Boente et al. (1987), and Zähle (2014).
In Strohriegl and Hable (2016) qualitative robustness for stochastic processes under the rather weak assumption of convergence of their empirical measure is examined and a generalization of Hampel's Theorem is given.

Often the finite sample distribution of the estimator or of the stochastic process of interest is unknown, hence an approximation of the distribution is needed. Commonly, the bootstrap is used to receive an approximation of the unknown finite sample distribution by resampling from the given sample.

The classical bootstrap, also called the empirical bootstrap, has been introduced by Efron (1979) for i.i.d. random variables. This concept is based on drawing a bootstrap sample $(Z_1^*, \dots, Z_m^*)$ of size m with replacement out of the original sample $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ and approximate the theoretical distribution P_n of $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ by the distribution of the bootstrap sample P_n^*. For the empirical bootstrap the distribution of the bootstrap sample $(Z_1^*, \dots, Z_n^*)$ is given by the empirical distribution of the sample $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$, hence $P_n^* = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i^*}\right)$. For an introduction to the bootstrap see for example Efron and Tibshirani (1993) and van der Vaart (1998, Chapter 3.6). Besides the empirical bootstrap many other bootstrap methods have been developed in order to find good approximations also for non-i.i.d. observations, see for example Singh (1981), Lahiri (2003) and the references therein. In Section 2.2 the moving block bootstrap introduced by Künsch (1989) and Liu and Singh (1992), is used to approximate the distribution of an α-mixing stochastic process.

It is, also in the non-i.i.d. case, still desirable that the estimator is qualitatively robust even for the bootstrap approximation. That is, the distribution of the estimator under the bootstrap approximation $\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)$ of the assumed, ideal distribution P_n should still be close to the distribution of the estimator under the bootstrap approximation $\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)$ of the contaminated distribution Q_n. Cuevas and Romo (1993) already describes a concept of qualitative robustness of bootstrap approximations for the i.i.d. case and for real valued estimators. In Christmann et al. (2013) qualitative robustness of Efron's bootstrap approximation is shown for the i.i.d. case for a class of regularized kernel based learning methods. In Strohriegl and Hable (2016) Hampel's Theorem about qualitative robustness for statistical estimators which can be represented through a statistical operator is generalized to non-i.i.d. processes which provide convergence of their empirical measure. We also consider estimators which can be represented by a continuous statistical operator on the space of all probability measures and stochastic process which provide a convergence condition on their empirical measure and we try to generalize the result in Christmann et al. (2013) to non-i.i.d. observations.

The next chapter contains a definition of qualitative robustness of the bootstrap approximation of an estimator and the main results. In Chapter 2.1 Theorem 2.2 shows qualitative robustness of the bootstrap approximation of an estimator for independent but not necessarily identically distributed random variables, Chapter 2.2 contains Theorem 2.7 and 2.9 which generalize the result in Christmann et al. (2013) to α-mixing sequences with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$. All proofs are deferred to the appendix.

2 Qualitative robustness for bootstrap estimators

Throughout this paper, let $(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ be a Polish space with metric $d_{\mathcal{Z}}$ and Borel-σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$. Denote by $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$ the set of all probability measures on $(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{B}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}})$. Let $(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{B}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}))$ be the underlying statistical model. If nothing else is stated, we always use Borel-σ-algebras for topological spaces. Let $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the coordinate process on $\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}$, that is $Z_i : \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{Z}$, $(z_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \mapsto z_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the process has law $P_{\mathbb{N}}$ under $P_{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$. Moreover let $P_n := (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n) \circ P_{\mathbb{N}}$ be the n-th order marginal distribution of $P_{\mathbb{N}}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $P_{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$. We are concerned with a sequence of estimators $(S_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ on the stochastic process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. The estimator may take its values in any Polish space (H, d_H); that is, $S_n : \mathcal{Z}^n \to H$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Our work applies to estimators which can be represented by a statistical operator $S : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}) \to H$, that is,

$$S\big(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}\big) \;=\; S_n(\mathbf{w}_n) \;=\; S_n(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \qquad \forall\, \mathbf{w}_n = (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \quad \forall\, n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}$ denotes the empirical measure defined by $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}(B) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I_B(z_i)$, $B \in \mathcal{B}$, for the observations $\mathbf{w}_n = (z_1, ..., z_n) \in \mathcal{Z}^n$. Examples of such estimators are M-estimators, R-estimators, see Huber (1981, Theorem 2.6), or Support Vector Machines, see Hable and Christmann (2011) and Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Theorem 4).

The bootstrap approximation of the distribution of the estimator S_n stands for the distribution of the estimator S_n under the bootstrap approximation P_n^* at P_n, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)$, which is a random object as P_n^* is random. For notational convenience all bootstrap values are noted with an asterisk.

Based on the generalization of Hampel's concept of Π-robustness from Bustos (1980), we define qualitative robustness for bootstrap approximations for non-i.i.d sequences of random variables. The stronger concept of Π-robustness is needed here, as we do not assume to have i.i.d. random variables, which are used in Cuevas and Romo (1993). Therefore the definition of qualitative robustness stated below is stronger than the definition in Cuevas and Romo (1993).

Contrarily to the original definitions of qualitative robustness in Bustos (1980) the bounded Lipschitz metric is used instead of the Prokhorov metric d_{Pro} on th space of probability measures $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ on $\mathcal{Z}$:

$$d_{\text{BL}}(P, Q) := \sup\left\{\left|\int f dP - \int f dQ\right| \;:\; f \in \text{BL}, \|f\|_{\text{BL}} \le 1\right\}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{BL}} := |\cdot|_1 + \|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the bounded Lipschitz norm with $|f|_1 = \sup_{x\neq y} \frac{|f(x)-f(y)|}{d(x,y)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ the supremum norm $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_x |f(x)|$. This is due to technical reasons only. Both metrics metricizes the weak topology on the space of all probability measures $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^n)$, for Polish spaces $\mathcal{Z}^n$ see, for example, Huber (1981, Corollary 4.3) or Dudley (1989, Theorem 11.3.3), and therefore can be treated equally.

Definition 2.1 (Qualitative robustness for bootstrap approximations)
Let $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $Z_i : (\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{B}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}) \to (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, be a stochastic process with finite joint distribution $P_n := \mathcal{L}_{P_{\mathbb{N}}}(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n) = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n) \circ P_{\mathbb{N}}$. Let $P_n^* = \mathcal{L}_{P_{\mathbb{N}}^*}(Z_1^*, \ldots, Z_n^*)$ be the bootstrap approximation of P_n and let $S_n : \mathcal{Z}^n \to H$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of estimators. Then the sequence of bootstrap approximations $(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is called qualitatively robust at $P_{\mathbb{N}}$, if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \ge n_0$ and for every $Q_{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$,

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) < \delta \;\Rightarrow\; d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))) < \varepsilon. \tag{2}$$

Here $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n))$ (respectively $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))$) denotes the distribution of the bootstrap approximation of the estimator S_n under P_n^* (respectively Q_n^*).

As the estimators can be represented by a statistical operator which depends on the empirical measure it is crucial to concern stochastic processes which at last provide convergence of their empirical measure. Therefore, Strohriegl and Hable (2016) proposed to choose Varadarajan process. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a probability space. Let $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $Z_i : \Omega \to \mathcal{Z}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, be a stochastic process and $\mathbf{W}_n := (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$. Then the stochastic process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is called a *(strong) Varadarajan process* if there exists a probability measure $P \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ such that

$$d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}, P) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

The stochastic process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is called *weak Varadarajan process* if

$$d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}, P) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0 \quad \text{in probability.}$$

Examples for Varadarajan processes are certain Markov Chains, some mixing processes, ergodic process and processes which satisfy a law of large numbers for events in the sense of Steinwart et al. (2009, Definition 2.1), see Strohriegl and Hable (2016) for details.

2.1 Qualitative robustness for independent not identically distributed processes

The next theorem states a robustness result for the empirical bootstrap for independent, but not necessarily identically distributed random variables Z_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Qualitative robustness in the sense of Definition 2.1 requires equation (2) to hold uniformly in $Q_{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$, that is, the contaminated process can be an arbitrary stochastic process. The following result holds under assumptions both on the assumed ideal process, denoted by $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with joint distribution $P_{\mathbb{N}}$ and on the contaminated process, denoted by $(\tilde{Z}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with joint distribution $Q_{\mathbb{N}}$. The ideal process has to be a Varadarajan process and the random variables of both processes have to be independent, i.e. the real process must have the same structure as the assumed process. As the empirical bootstrap only works for a few processes, see for example Lahiri (2003), the assumptions on the true process are necessary. To our best knowledge there are no results concerning qualitative robustness of the bootstrap approximation for general stochastic processes without any assumptions on the second process and it is probably very hard to show qualitative robustness of the bootstrap approximation in the sense of Definition 2.1. Hence the next theorem shows qualitative robustness under some assumptions on the real contaminated process. However it generalizes Christmann et al. (2013, Theorem 3), as the assumptions on the stochastic process are weaker as well as the assumptions on the statistical operator.

Theorem 2.2 *Let the sequence of estimators $(S_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be represented by a statistical operator S : $S : (\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}), d_{\mathrm{BL}}) \to (H, d_H)$ via (1) for a Polish space H and let $(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ be a totally bounded metric space. If $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a strong Varadarajan process, if Z_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are mutually independent with distributions $P^i \in M(\mathcal{Z})$, if $S : (\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}), d_{\mathrm{BL}}) \to (H, d_H)$ is continuous at P, and the estimators*

$S_n : \mathcal{Z}^n \to H,\ n \in \mathbb{N}$, *are continuous, then we have:*
for every $\varepsilon > 0$ *there is* $\delta > 0$ *such that there is* $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for all* $n \geq n_0$ *and for every process* $\tilde{Z}_i : (\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{B}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}) \to (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})$ *where* $\tilde{Z}_i$ *are independent and have distribution* $Q^i \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}),\ i \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) < \delta \ \Rightarrow\ d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))) < \varepsilon.$$

A short look on the metrics used on $\mathcal{Z}^n$ is advisable. We consider $\mathcal{Z}^n$ as the n-fold product space of the Polish space $(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$. The product space $\mathcal{Z}^n$ is again a Polish space (in the product topology) and it is tempting to use a p-product metric $d_{n,p}$ on $\mathcal{Z}^n$, that is,

$$d_{n,p}\big((z_1, \ldots, z_n), (z_1', \ldots, z_n')\big) \ = \ \big\| \big(d_{\mathcal{Z}}(z_1, z_1'), \ldots, d_{\mathcal{Z}}(z_n, z_n')\big) \big\|_p \tag{3}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_p$ is a p_n-norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. For example, $d_{n,2}$ is the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $d_{n,\infty}\big((z_1, \ldots, z_n), (z_1', \ldots, z_n')\big) = \max_i d(z_i, z_i')$; all these metrics are strongly equivalent. However, these common metrics do not cover the intuitive meaning of qualitative robustness as the distance between two points in $\mathcal{Z}^n$ (i.e., two data sets) is small only if all coordinates are close together (small rounding errors). So points where only a small fraction of the coordinates are far-off (gross errors) are excluded. Using these metrics, the qualitative robustness of the sample mean at every $P_{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$ can be shown, see Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Proposition 1). But the sample mean is a highly non-robust estimator, as gross errors have great impact on the estimate. Following Boente et al. (1987), we use the metric d_n on $\mathcal{Z}^n$:

$$d_n\big((z_1, \ldots, z_n), (z_1', \ldots, z_n')\big) \ = \ \inf\left\{\varepsilon > 0 : \sharp\{i : d(z_i, z_i') \geq \varepsilon\}/n \leq \varepsilon\right\}. \tag{4}$$

This metric on $\mathcal{Z}^n$ covers both kinds of "small errors". Though d_n is not strongly equivalent to $d_{n,p}$ in general, it is topologically equivalent to the p-product metrics $d_{n,p}$, see Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Lemma 1). Hence, $\mathcal{Z}^n$ is metrizable also with metric d_n. Moreover the continuity of S_n on $\mathcal{Z}^n$ is with respect to the product topology on $\mathcal{Z}^n$ which can, due to the topological equivalence of these two metrics, be seen with respect to the common metrics $d_{n,p}$.

Remark 2.3 *The required properties on the statistical operator* S *and the sequence of estimators* $(S_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *in Theorem 2.2 ensure the qualitative robustness of* $(S_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$*, as long as the assumptions on the underlying processes hold. The proof shows that the bootstrap approximation of every sequence of estimators* $(S_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *which is qualitatively robust in the sense of the definitions in Bustos (1980) and Strohriegl and Hable (2016), is qualitatively robust in the sense of Theorem 2.2.*

The assumption in Theorem 2.2 are, for example, fulfilled by M- and R-estimators, see Hampel (1968, section 7) and Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Chapter 4).

The next part gives two examples of stochastic processes, which are independent, but not necessarily identically distributed and which are Varadarajan processes. In particular they even satisfy a strong law of large numbers for events (SLLNE) in the sense of Steinwart et al. (2009) and therefore are, due to Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Theorem 2), Varadarajan processes. The first example is rather simple and describes a sequence of univariate normal distributions.

Corollary 2.4 *Let* $(a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ *be a sequence with* $\lim_{i\to\infty} a_i = a \in \mathbb{R}$ *and let* $|a_i| \leq c$*, for a constant* $c > 0$ *for all* $i \in \mathbb{N}$*. Let* $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *,* $Z_i : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a stochastic process where* Z_i*,* $i \in \mathbb{N}$ *are independent and* $Z_i \sim N(a_i, 1),\ i \in \mathbb{N}$*. Then the process* $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is a strong Varadarajan process.*

The second example are stochastic processes where the distributions of the random variables Z_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, are all lying in a so called shrinking ε- neighbourhood of a probability measure P.

Corollary 2.5 *Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be a measurable space and let $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a stochastic process with independent random variables $Z_i : \Omega \to \mathcal{Z}$, $Z_i \sim P^i$ where*

$$P^i = (1 - \varepsilon_i)P + \varepsilon\tilde{P}^i$$

for a sequence $\varepsilon_i \longrightarrow 0$, $i \to \infty$, $\varepsilon_i > 0$ and $\tilde{P}^i$, $P \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$. Then the process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a strong Varadarajan process.

The next corollary shows, that Support Vector Machines are qualitatively robust. For a detailed introduction to Support Vector Machines see e.g., Schölkopf and Smola (2002) and Steinwart and Christmann (2008). Let $D_n := (z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n) = ((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ be a given dataset.

Corollary 2.6 *Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be a totally bounded, metric space and let $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a stochastic process where the random variables Z_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent and $Z_i \sim P^i := (1 - \varepsilon_i)P + \varepsilon_i\tilde{P}^i$, $P, \tilde{P}^i \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$. Moreover let $(\lambda_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive real valued numbers with $\lambda_n \to \lambda_0$, $n \to \infty$, for some $\lambda_0 > 0$. Let H be a reproducing kernel Hilbert space with continuous and bounded kernel k and let $S_{\lambda_n} : (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^n \to H$ be the SVM estimator, which maps D_n to f_{L^*,D_n,λ_n} for a continuous and convex loss function $L : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \to [0, \infty[$. It is assumed that $L(x, y, y) = 0$ for every $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ and that L is additionally Lipschitz continuous in the last argument.*
Then we have for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$ and for every process $(\tilde{Z}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $\tilde{Z}_i$ are independent and have distribution Q^i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) < \delta \;\Rightarrow\; d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))) < \varepsilon.$$

That is, the sequence of bootstrap approximations is qualitatively robust if the second (contaminated) process $(\tilde{Z}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is still of the same kind, i.e. still independent, as the original uncontaminated process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$.

2.2 Qualitative robustness for the moving block bootstrap of α-mixing processes

Dropping the independence assumption we now focus on mixing processes, in particular on stationary α-mixing or strong mixing stochastic processes. The mixing notion is an important and well-accepted dependence notion which quantifies the degree of dependence of a stochastic process. There are various types of mixing, for an overview and for examples, see Bradley (2005) or Doukhan (1994). Let Ω be a set equipped with two σ-algebras $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ and a probability measure μ and let $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{A}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$ be the space of $\mathbb{R}$-valued, $\mathcal{A}$-measurable, p-integrable functions, $p \in [1, \infty]$. The α-mixing coefficient is defined as

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2) := \sup\{|\mu(A_1 \cap A_2) - \mu(A_1)\mu(A_2)| \quad | \, A_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1, \; A_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2\}.$$

A stochastic process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is said to be α-mixing if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha(\sigma(Z_1, \ldots, Z_i), \sigma(Z_{i+n}, \ldots), \mu) = 0$$

and weakly α-bi mixing, if

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\alpha(\sigma(Z_i),\sigma(Z_j),\mu)\longrightarrow 0. \tag{5}$$

Instead of Efron's empirical bootstrap we use another bootstrap approach in order to represent the dependence structure of an α-mixing process. Künsch (1989) and Liu and Singh (1992) independently introduced the moving block bootstrap (MBB). As resampling of single observations often can not preserve the dependence structure of the process, they decided to take blocks of length b of observations instead. Within these blocks the dependence structure of the process is preserved. The block length b increases with the number of observations n. A slight modification of the original moving block bootstrap, see for example Politis and Romano (1990) and Shao and Yu (1993), is used in the next two theorems in order to avoid edge effects.

The proofs of the next theorems are based on central limit theorems for empirical processes. There are several results concerning the moving block bootstrap of the empirical process in case of mixing processes, for example Bühlmann (1994), Naik-Nimbalkar and Rajarshi (1994) and Peligrad (1998, Theorem 2.2) for α-mixing sequences and Radulović (1996) and Bühlmann (1995) for β-mixing sequences. Theorem 2.7 shows qualitative robustness for a stochastic process with values in $\mathbb{R}$ and is based on Peligrad (1998, Theorem 2.2), which provides the CLT under assumptions on the process, which are weaker than those in Bühlmann (1994) and Naik-Nimbalkar and Rajarshi (1994). In the case of $\mathbb{R}^d$ valued stochastic processes, stronger assumptions on the stochastic process are needed, as the Central Limit Theorem in Bühlmann (1994) requires stronger assumptions, see Theorem 2.9. To our best knowledge there are no results concerning qualitative robustness for the bootstrap approximation of estimators for α-mixing stochastic processes.

Let $Z_1,\ldots,Z_n$ be the first n projections of the stochastic process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and let $b\in\mathbb{N}, b<n$ be the block length. Then the sample can be divided into blocks $B_{i,b}:=(Z_i,\ldots,Z_{i+b-1})$ where $Z_{n+i}=Z_i$. To get the MBB bootstrap sample $\mathbf{W}^*=(Z_1^*,\ldots,Z_n^*)$, k numbers $I_1,\ldots,I_k$ from the set $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ are randomly chosen with replacement, where $k:=[n/b]$. Without loss of generality it is assumed, that $n=kb$, if n is not a multiple of b we simply cut the last block. Then the sample consists of the blocks $B_{I_1,b},B_{I_2,b},\ldots,B_{i_k,b}$, that is $Z_1^*=Z_{I_1},Z_2^*=Z_{I_1+1},\ldots Z_b^*=_{I_1+b-1},Z_{b+1}^*=Z_{I_2},\ldots,Z_{kb}^*=Z_{I_k+b-1}$.

As we are interested in estimators which can be represented by a statistical operator $S\colon\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})\to H$ via $S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n})=S_n(z_1,\ldots,z_n)$, for a Polish space H, see (1), the empirical measure of the bootstrap sample $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}=\frac{1}{k\cdot b}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_{Z_i^*}$ should represent the empirical measure of the original sample $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_{Z_i}$. Contrarily to the qualitative robustness in the case of independent and not necessarily identically distributed random variables (Theorem 2.2), the assumptions on the statistical operator are strengthened for the case of α-mixing sequences. In particular the statistical operator has to be uniformly continuous for all $P\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$. For the first Theorem we assume the random variables $Z_i,\ i\in\mathbb{N}$ to be bounded. Without loss of generality we assume $0\le Z_1\le 1$, otherwise multiplying by a constant will lead to this assumption.

Theorem 2.7 *Let the stochastic process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, $Z_i:\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}\to\mathbb{R}$ be real valued, bounded, strongly stationary and α-mixing with*

$$\sum_{m>n}\alpha(\sigma(Z_1,\ldots,Z_i),\sigma(Z_{i+m},\ldots),\mu)=\mathcal{O}(n^{-\gamma}),\ \gamma>0. \tag{6}$$

Denote the bootstrap sample of $\mathbf{W}_n = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ *of the moving block bootstrap by* $\mathbf{W}_n^* = (Z_1^*, \ldots, Z_n^*)$ *and let* $b(n)$ *and* $k(n)$ *be sequences of integers satisfying*

$$n^h \in \mathcal{O}(b(n)),\ b(n) \in \mathcal{O}(n^{1/3-a}),\ \text{for some}\ 0 < h < \frac{1}{3} - a,\ 0 < a < \frac{1}{3},$$

$b(n) = b(2^k)$ *for* $2^k \leq n \leq 2^{k+1}$, $b(n) \to \infty$, $n \to \infty$ *and* $b(n) \cdot k(n) = n$. *Let* H *be a Polish space,* $(S_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *, be a sequence of estimators such that* $S_n : \mathbb{R}^n \to H$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *is continuous and such that* S_n *can be represented through a statistical operator* $S : (\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}), d_{\mathrm{BL}}) \to (H, d_H)$ *via* (1) *which is additionally uniformly continuous. Then, for all*$\varepsilon > 0$ *there is* $\delta > 0$ *such that there is* $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that, for all* $n \geq n_0$ *and for all stochastic processes* $(\tilde{Z}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *that are real valued, bounded, strongly stationary, and* α*-mixing as required in* (6)*, we have:*

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) < \delta \ \Rightarrow\ d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))) < \varepsilon. \tag{7}$$

The assumptions on the stochastic process are on the one hand, together with the assumptions on the block length, used to ensure the validity of the bootstrap approximation and on the other hand, together with the assumptions on the statistical operator, respectively the sequence of estimators, to ensure the qualitative robustness.

Remark 2.8 *The assumptions on the second process, that is on the contaminated process, can be replaced through other dependence assumptions, such that the process still provides convergence of* $d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}) \longrightarrow_P 0$ *almost surely for the same bootstrap procedure and additionally is a Varadarajan process. That is the contaminated process can have another mixing structure as long as the bootstrap still works for this process.*

The next theorem generalizes this result to stochastic processes with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d > 1$, instead of $\mathbb{R}$. It shows, that for example the bootstrap version of the SVM estimator is qualitatively robust. The proof of the next theorem follows the same lines as the proof of the theorem above, but requires another central limit theorem, which is shown in Bühlmann (1994). Therefore stronger assumptions on the mixing property of the stochastic process are needed and the random variables Z_i are required to have continuous marginal distributions. Again the bootstrap sample results of a moving block bootstrap where $k(n)$ blocks of length $b(n)$ are chosen, again assuming $k \cdot b = n$.

Theorem 2.9 *Let the stochastic process* $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *,* $Z_i : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, *be strongly stationary and* α*-mixing with*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (i+1)^{8d+7} (\alpha(\sigma(Z_1, \ldots, Z_i), \sigma(Z_{i+m}, \ldots), \mu))^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty, \tag{8}$$

and let Z_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, *have continuous marginal distributions. Denote the bootstrap sample of* $\mathbf{W}_n = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ *of the moving block bootstrap by* $\mathbf{W}_n^* = (Z_1^*, \ldots, Z_n^*)$ *and let* $b(n)$ *be a sequences of integers satisfying*

$$b(n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{\frac{1}{2}-a}) \text{ for some } a > 0.$$

Let H *be a Polish space,* $(S_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence of estimators such that* $S_n : \mathbb{R}^n \to H$ *is continuous and assume that* S_n *can be represented through a statistical operator* $S : (\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n), d_{\mathrm{BL}}) \to (H, d_H)$ *via* (1) *which is additionally uniformly continuous.*

Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $n \geq n_0$ and for all stochastic process $(\tilde{Z}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ that are strongly stationary and α-mixing as required in (8):

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) < \delta \;\Rightarrow\; d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))) < \varepsilon.$$

Although the assumptions on the statistical operator S were strengthened, for example many M-estimators and many SVM estimators are still qualitatively robust for the bootstrap approximation for α-mixing processes, if the sample space $(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$, $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is compact. The compactness of $(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ implies the compactness of $(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}), d_{\mathrm{BL}})$, see Parthasarathy (1967, Theorem 6.4). Therefore the uniform continuity of the statistical operator S follows from the continuity of the operator.

Acknowledgements: This research was partially supported by the DFG Grant 291/2-1 "Support Vector Machines bei stochastischer Unabhängigkeit". Moreover I would like to thank Andreas Christmann for helpful discussions on this topic.

3 Proofs

This section contains the proofs of the main theorems and corollaries.

3.1 Proofs of Section 2.1

At first we state a rather technical Lemma, which is needed to prove Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $P_n, Q_n \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^n)$, such that $P_n = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n P^i$ and $Q_n = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n Q^i$, $P^i, Q^i \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for all $\delta > 0$:*

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) \leq \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i\right) \leq \delta.$$

Proof:

By assumption we have $d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) \leq \delta$. Hence, see Dudley (1989, Theorem 11.3.3.) for every $g \in C_b(\mathcal{Z}^n)$:

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} g dP_n - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} g dQ_n \right| \leq \delta. \tag{9}$$

Let $f \in C_b(\mathcal{Z})$ be arbitrarily chosen, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}} f d \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P^i(z_i) \right] - \int_{\mathcal{Z}} f(z_i) d \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} Q^i \right] \right| = \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\int_{\mathcal{Z}} f dP^i - \int_{\mathcal{Z}} f dQ^i \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} f(z_i) dP^i(z_i) d \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq i} P^j(z_j) \right) - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} f(z_i) dQ^i(z_i) d \left(\bigotimes_{j \neq i} Q^j(z_j) \right) \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} f(z_i) d \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{n} P^j(z_j) \right) - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} f(z_i) d \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{n} Q^j(z_j) \right) \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \left[\int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(z_i) d \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{n} P^j(z_j) \right) - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(z_i) d \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{n} Q^j(z_j) \right) \right] \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, $\tilde{f} : \mathcal{Z}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$; $f(z_1, \ldots, z_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(z_i)$ is a finite sum of continuous functions and therefore continuous and, as f is bounded, $\tilde{f}$ is also bounded. Hence $\tilde{f} \in C_b(\mathcal{Z}^n)$ and

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} \tilde{f} d \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{n} P^j \right) (z_1, \ldots, z_n)) - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} \tilde{f} d \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^{n} Q^j \right) (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \right| = \left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} \tilde{f} dP_n - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} \tilde{f} dQ_n \right| \leq \delta.$$

Hence,

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P^i, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} Q^i \right) \overset{(9)}{\leq} \delta. \qquad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 2.2:

To prove Theorem 2.2 we first use the triangle inequality to split the distance between the distribution of the estimator S_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, into two parts regarding the distribution under the joint distribution P_n of $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$.

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)) \leq \underbrace{d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n))}_{I} + \underbrace{d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))}_{II}.$$

Then the representation of the estimator S_n by the statistical operator S and the continuity of this operator in P together with the Varadarajan property and the independence assumption on the stochastic process yield the assertion.

For part I define the random variables
$\mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{Z}^n$, $\mathbf{W}_n = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ and $\mathbf{W}_n^* : \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{Z}^n$, $\mathbf{W}_n^* = (Z_1^*, \ldots, Z_n^*)$ with joint distribution $K^{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$ and marginal distributions $K^{\mathbb{N}}(B_1 \times \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}) = P_{\mathbb{N}}(B_1)$ for all $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ and $K^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \times B_2) = P_{\mathbb{N}}^*(B_2)$ for all $B_2 \in \mathcal{B}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. That is, $\mathbf{W}_n$ has distribution $\mathbf{W}_n \circ K^{\mathbb{N}} = P_n$ and $\mathbf{W}_n^*$ has distribution $\mathbf{W}_n^* \circ K^{\mathbb{N}} = P_n^*$.

As the random variables Z_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent $P_n = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n P^i$, for $P^i = Z_i \circ P_{\mathbb{N}}$. Moreover Efron's bootstrap is used and therefore $Z_i^* \sim \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}$, hence, $P_n^* = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}$.

By assumption $(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is a totally bounded metric space. Hence $\mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is a uniform Glivenko Cantelli class, due to Dudley et al. (1991, Proposition 12). That is for all $\eta > 0$ we have, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{P\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})} Pr\left\{\sup_{m\geq n} d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_m}, P) > \eta\right\} = 0$, where Pr denotes the outer probability. Hence for all $\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n$:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})} Pr\left\{\sup_{m\geq n} d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_m^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) > \eta\right\} = 0.$$

Respectively for every $\delta_0 > 0$ there is $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_1$ and all $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) \leq \delta_0 \text{ almost surely.} \tag{10}$$

As the process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a strong Varadarajan process by assumption, there exists a probability measure $P \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ such that

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}, P) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary but fixed. Then, for every $\delta_0 > 0$ there is $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_2$:

$$P_{\mathbb{N}}\left(d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}, P) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{11}$$

Define the set $B_n := \left\{\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, P) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2}\right\}$. The Varadarajan property, see equation (11), yields for all $n \geq n_2$: $P_n(B_n) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Moreover, for all $\mathbf{w}_n \in B_n$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}, P) \leq d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) + d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, P) \leq 2\delta_0 \text{ almost surely.} \tag{12}$$

The continuity of the statistical operator $S : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}) \to H$ in $P \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ yields, that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P, Q) \leq \delta_0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_H(S(P), S(Q)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}. \tag{13}$$

Hence, for all $n \geq \max\{n_1, n_2\}$ and for all $w_n \in B_n$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}), S(P)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \text{ almost surely and} \\ &d_H(S(P), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n})) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

The triangle inequality shows for all $\mathbf{w}_n \in B_n$:

$$d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n})) \leq d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}), S(P)) + d_H(S(P), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n})) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ almost surely.}$$

With Dudley (1989, Theorem 11.3.5) we conclude for the Prokhorov metric d_{Pro}:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n)) &= d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n^*, S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n) \\ &\leq \inf\left\{\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0 \mid K^{\mathbb{N}}\left(d_H(S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n^*, S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n) > \tilde{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\right\} \\ &= \inf\left\{\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0 \mid (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S_n(\mathbf{w}_n^*), S_n(\mathbf{w}_n)) > \tilde{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Due to the definition of the statistical operator, this is equivalent to

$$\inf\{\tilde{\varepsilon} \mid (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}}) \left\{(\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n})) > \tilde{\varepsilon}\right\} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\}.$$

Now, for every fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, there are $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq \max\{n_1, n_2\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}}) \left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n})) > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
&= (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}}) \left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*)}), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}))) > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
&= 1 - (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}}) \left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n})) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
&\leq 1 - (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}}) \left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}), S(P)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \text{ and } d_H(S(P), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n})) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) \\
&\overset{(13)}{\leq} 1 - (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}}) \left\{(\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}, P) \leq \delta_0 \text{ and } d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) \leq \delta_0\right\} \\
&\leq 1 - (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}}) \left\{(\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}, P) \leq \delta_0 \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_n \in B_n\right\} \\
&\overset{(12)}{\leq} 1 - K^{\mathbb{N}} \left\{(\mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{N}}, \mathbf{w}'_{\mathbb{N}}) \in \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid \mathbf{W}_n(\mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{N}}) \in B_n\right\} \text{ almost surely} \\
&\leq 1 - P_n(B_n) \text{ almost surely} \\
&\overset{(11)}{<} \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ almost surely.}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that vor all $n \geq \max\{n_1, n_2\}$, the infimum in equation (14) is bounded by ε and therefore

$$d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

The equivalence between Prokhorov metric and bounded Lipschitz metric for Polish spaces, see Huber (1981, Corollary 4.3) then yields: for every $n \geq \max\{\tilde{n}_1, \tilde{n}_2\} := n_{0,1}$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ almost surely.} \tag{15}$$

For the second part define the random variables

$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n : \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{Z}^n$, $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n = (\tilde{Z}_1, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_n)$ with distribution $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n(Q_{\mathbb{N}}) = Q_n$ and
$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^* : \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{Z}^n$, $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^* = (\tilde{Z}_1^*, \ldots, \tilde{Z}_n^*)$ with distribution $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{n}^*(Q_{\mathbb{N}}) = Q_n^*$. Moreover let $\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$ be the joint distribution of $\mathbf{W}_{\mathbb{N}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathbb{N}}^*$ with marginal distributions $P_{\mathbb{N}}$, $Q_{\mathbb{N}}$ and $Q_{\mathbb{N}}^*$.

First, similar to part I, Efron's bootstrap and Dudley et al. (1991, Proposition 12) give for all $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n$:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})} Pr\left(\left\{\sup_{m \geq n} d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_m^*}, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n}) > \eta\right\}\right) = 0,$$

respectively for every $\delta_0 > 0$ there is $n_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_3$ and all $\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*}, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n}) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{5} \text{ almost surely.} \tag{16}$$

Moreover, as the random variables Z_i, $Z_i \sim P^i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent, the distance between the empirical measure and $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i$ can be bounded, due to Dudley et al. (1991, Theorem 7). As totally bounded spaces are particularly separable, see Denkowski et al. (2003, below Corollary 1.4.28), Dudley et al. (1991, Proposition 12) shows that $\mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is a uniform Glivenko Cantelli class. The proof of this theorem does not depend on the distributions of the random variables Z_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and is therefore also valid for independent and not necessarily identically distributed random variables. So Dudley et al. (1991, Theorem 7) yields for all $\eta > 0$:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{(P^i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\in(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}))^{\mathbb{N}}} P_{\mathbb{N}}\left(\sup_{m\geq n} d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n(\mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{N}})}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i\right) > \eta\right) = 0.$$

Respectively

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{(P^i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\in(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}))^{\mathbb{N}}} P_{\mathbb{N}}\left(\sup_{m\geq n}\sup_{f\in\mathrm{BL}_1}\left|\int f d\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n(\mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{N}})} - \int f d\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i\right]\right| > \eta\right) = 0,$$

as long as the assumptions hold. As $\mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is bounded $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$, see Dudley et al. (1991, page 499, before Proposition 10), hence it is to show that $\mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is image admissible Suslin. By assumption $(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is totally bounded, hence $\mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is separable with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, see Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Lemma 3). As $f \in \mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ implies $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$, the space $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is a bounded subset of $(C_b(Z, d_{\mathcal{Z}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$, which is due to Dudley (1989, Theorem 2.4.9) complete. Then $\mathrm{BL}(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is complete, due to Denkowski et al. (2003, Proposition 1.4.17). Therefore $\mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is separable and complete with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and particularly a Suslin space, see Dudley (2014, p.229). As Lipschitz continuous functions are also equicontinuous, Dudley (2014, Theorem 5.28) shows that $\mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{Z}, d_{\mathcal{Z}})$ is image admissible Suslin.

Hence, Dudley et al. (1991, Theorem 7) yields for all $(P^i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in (\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}))^{\mathbb{N}}$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i\right) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

And similarly for $\tilde{Z}_i$ $\tilde{Z}_i \sim Q^i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$: for all $(Q^i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in (\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}))^{\mathbb{N}}$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i\right) \longrightarrow 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

That is, there is $n_4 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_4$

$$P_n\left(\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i\right) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \tag{17}$$

$$Q_n\left(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i\right) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{6}. \tag{18}$$

Moreover, due to Lemma 3.1, we have

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{5} \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i\right) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{5}, \tag{19}$$

and the strong Varadarajan property of $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, yields that there is $n_5 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $n \geq n_5$:

$$P_n\left(d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, P) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{6}. \tag{20}$$

Hence, equations (16) to (20) yield for all $n \geq \max\{n_3, n_4, n_5\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*}) &\leq d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}) + d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i\right) + d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i\right) \\ &\quad + d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n}\right) + d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n}, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*}) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta_0}{5} + \frac{\delta_0}{5} + \frac{\delta_0}{5} + \frac{\delta_0}{5} + \frac{\delta_0}{5} \;=\; \delta_0 \text{ almost surely.} \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The continuity of the statistical operator S in P, see equation (13), for all $n \geq \max\{n_3, n_4, n_5\}$ yields:

$$d_H(S(P), S(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*})) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \text{ almost surely,}$$

and

$$d_H(S(P), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n})) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \text{ almost surely.}$$

Hence,

$$d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}), S(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*})) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ almost surely.}$$

Similar to part I we conclude for the Prokhorov metric d_{Pro}, using Dudley (1989, Theorem 11.3.5):

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)) &= d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n, S_n \circ \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*) \\ &= \inf\{\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0 \mid (\mathbf{W}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*,)(\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S_n(\mathbf{w}_n), S_n(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*)) > \tilde{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the definition of the statistical operator S, this is equivalent to

$$\inf\{\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0 \mid (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}), S(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*})) > \tilde{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\}.$$

For all $n \geq \max\{n_3, n_4, n_5\}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}), S(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*})) > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\ &= (\mathbf{W}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*)(\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}), S(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*})) > \frac{\varepsilon}{2},\ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n\right) \\ &\leq (\mathbf{W}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*)(\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}), S(P)) > \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \text{ or } d_H(S(P), S(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*})) > \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) \\ &\overset{(13)}{\leq} (\mathbf{W}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*)(\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, P) > \delta_0 \text{ or } d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*}) > \delta_0\right) \\ &\overset{(21)}{\leq} (\mathbf{W}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*)(\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, P) > \frac{\delta_0}{5} \text{ or } d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i\right) > \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right. \\ &\qquad \left. \text{or } d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i\right) > \frac{\delta_0}{5} \text{ or } d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n(\mathbf{w}'_{\mathbb{N}})}\right) > \frac{\delta_0}{5} \text{ or } d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n}, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*}) > \frac{\delta_0}{5}.\right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, assume $d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{5}$, then (19) yields $d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i\right) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{5}$, therefore this term can be omitted in the equation above. Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbf{W}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*)(\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}}) \left((\mathbf{w}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}), S(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*})) > \varepsilon\right) \\
&\overset{(19)}{\leq} (\mathbf{W}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n^*)(\tilde{K}^{\mathbb{N}}) \left((\mathbf{w}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n, \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, P) > \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right. \\
&\qquad \left. \text{or } d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i\right) > \frac{\delta_0}{5} \text{ or } \; d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n}\right) > \frac{\delta_0}{5} \text{ or } d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n}, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n^*}) > \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) \\
&\overset{(16)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}_n\left(\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, P) > \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) + \mathbb{P}_n\left(\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}, \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n P^i\right) > \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) + \\
&\qquad \mathbb{Q}_n\left(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Q^i, \mathbb{Q}_{\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_n}\right) > \frac{\delta_0}{5}\right) \text{ almost surely} \\
&\overset{(17),(18),(20)}{<} \frac{\varepsilon}{6} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} + \frac{\varepsilon}{6} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ almost surely.}
\end{aligned}
$$

The equivalence between Prokhorov metric and bounded Lipschitz metric on Polish spaces, see Huber (1981, Corollary 4.3) then yields: for every $n \geq \max\{\tilde{n}_3, \tilde{n}_4, \tilde{n}_5\} := n_{0,2}$ and if $d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) \leq \frac{\delta_0}{5}$:

$$
d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{22}
$$

Now, equation (15) and (22) yield for all $n \geq \max\{n_{0,1}, n_{0,2}\}$:

$$
d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)) < \varepsilon \text{ almost surely.} \tag{23}
$$

Recall that $\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n) =: \zeta_n$ and $\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n) =: \xi_n$ are random quantities with values in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$.

Hence equation (23) is equivalent to

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))\right] < \varepsilon, \text{ for all } n \geq \max\{n_{0,1}, n_{0,2}\},
$$

respectively

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\zeta_n, \xi_n)\right] < \varepsilon, \text{ for all } n \geq \max\{n_{0,1}, n_{0,2}\}.
$$

Therefore, for all $f \in \mathrm{BL}_1(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}))$ and for all $n \geq \max\{n_{0,1}, n_{0,2}\}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\int f d(\mathcal{L}(\zeta_n)) - \int f d(\mathcal{L}(\xi_n)\right| &= \left|\mathbb{E}f(\zeta_n) - \mathbb{E}f(\xi_n)\right| \leq \mathbb{E}\left|f(\zeta_n) - f(\xi_n)\right| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left(|f|_1 \, d_{BL}(\zeta_n, \xi_n)\right) \quad < \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}
$$

by a Variant of Strassen's Theorem, see Huber (1981, Theorem 4.2). That is,

$$
d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))) < \varepsilon \text{ for all } n \geq \max\{n_{0,1}, n_{0,2}\}.
$$

Hence for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we find $\delta = \frac{\delta_0}{5}$ and $n_0 = \max\{n_{0,1}, n_{0,2},$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) < \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))) < \varepsilon.$$

□

Proof of Corollary 2.4:

Without any restriction we assume $a = 0$. Otherwise regard the process $Z_i - a$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By assumption, the random variables Z_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, are independent. Hence $1_B \circ Z_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, are independent, see for example Hoffmann-Jørgensen (1994, Theorem 2.10.6) for all measurable $B \subset \Omega$, as 1_B is a measurable function. According to Steinwart et al. (2009, Proposition 2.8) $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the SLLNE if there is a probability measure P in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\mu I_B \circ Z_i = P(B)$ for all measurable $B \subset \Omega$. Hence:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\mu I_B \circ Z_i \;=\; \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int I_B dZ_i(\mu) \;=\; \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int I_B f_i d\lambda,$$

where $f_i(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-a_i)^2}$ denotes the density of the normal distribution with respect to the Lebesgue measure λ. Moreover define $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x+c)^2}, & x < -c \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}, & -c \le x \le c \\ e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-c)^2}, & c < x \end{cases}.$$

Therefore $|f_i| \le |g|$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, g is integrable and due to Lebesgue's Theorem, see for example Hoffmann-Jørgensen (1994, Theorem 3.6):

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int I_B f_i d\lambda \;=\; \lim_{n\to\infty} \int \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_B f_i d\lambda \;=\; \int \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_B f_i d\lambda. \tag{24}$$

We have $f_i \to f_0$, where $f_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, as $a_i \to 0$ and therefore the Lemma of Kronecker, see for example Hoffmann-Jørgensen (1994, Theorem 4.9, equation 4.9.1) yields: $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x) = f_0(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Now equation (24) yields the SLLNE:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int I_B f_i d\lambda = \int I_B f_0 d\lambda = P(B).$$

With Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Theorem 2) the Varadarajan property follows. □

Proof of Corollary 2.5:

Similar to the proof of corollary 2.4 we first show the SLLNE, that is there exists a probability measure $P \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int I_B \circ Z_i d\mu = P(B), \text{ for all measurable } B \subset \Omega.$$

Now, let $B \subset \Omega$ be an arbitrary measurable set, then:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int I_B \circ Z_i d\mu = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} I_B dP^i = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} I_B d[(1-\varepsilon_i)P + \varepsilon_i \tilde{P}^i]$$
$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_{\mathcal{Z}} I_B dP - \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i \int_{\mathcal{Z}} I_B dP + \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i \int_{\mathcal{Z}} I_B d\tilde{P}^i. \tag{25}$$

As, $0 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i \int I_B dP \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i$ and $\varepsilon_i \to 0$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i \int I_B dP \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i \longrightarrow 0, \ n \to \infty$$

and similarly

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i \int I_B d\tilde{P}^i \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i \longrightarrow 0 \quad n \to \infty.$$

Hence equation (25) yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I_B \circ Z_i = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int I_B dP = P(B)$$

and therefore, due to Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Theorem 2) the assertion. □

Proof of Corollary 2.6:

Due to Corollary 2.5, the stochastic process is a Varadarajan process. Hable and Christmann (2011, Theorem 3.2) ensures the continuity of the statistical operator $S : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}) \to H, \ P \mapsto f_{L^*,P,\lambda}$ for a fixed value $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover Hable and Christmann (2011, Corollary 3.4) yields the continuity of the estimator $S_n : \mathcal{Z}^n \to H, \ D_n \mapsto f_{L^*,D_n,\lambda}$ for every fixed $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$. Hence for fixed $\lambda > 0$ the bootstrap approximation of the SVM estimator is qualitatively robust, for the given assumptions. Moreover the proof of Theorem 2.2, equation (23), and the equivalence between between bounded Lipschitz metric and Prokhorov distance yield: for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$ and if $d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) \leq \delta$:

$$d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)) < \varepsilon \text{ almost surely.}$$

Similarly to the proof of the qualitative robustness in Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Theorem 4) we get: for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is n_ε, such that for all $n \geq n_\varepsilon$:

$$\|f_{L^*,D_n,\lambda_n} - f_{L^*,D_n,\lambda_0}\|_H \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

And the same argumentation as in the proof of the qualitative robustness of the SVM estimator for the non-i.i.d. case in Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Theorem 4) for the cases $n_0 \leq n \leq n_\varepsilon$ and $n > n_\varepsilon$ yields the assertion. □

3.2 Proofs of Section 2.2

Proof of Theorem 2.7:

First, the triangle inequality yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
&d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)) \\
&\leq \underbrace{d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n))}_{I} + \underbrace{d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n))}_{II} + \underbrace{d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))}_{III}.
\end{aligned}$$

First, we show the convergence of part II, let $\sigma(Z_i),\ i \in \mathbb{N}$, be the σ-algebra generated by Z_i. Due to the assumptions on the mixing process $\sum_{m>n} \alpha(\sigma(Z_1, \ldots, Z_i), \sigma(Z_{m+i}, \ldots), \mu) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\gamma}),\ i \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma > 0$. The sequence $(\alpha(\sigma(Z_1, \ldots, Z_i), \sigma(Z_{m+i}, \ldots), \mu))_{m\in\mathbb{N}} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\gamma}),\ i \in \mathbb{N}$, is a null sequence and bounded by the definition of the α- mixing coefficient, which, due to the strong stationarity, does not depend on i. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha(\sigma(Z_i), \sigma(Z_j), \mu) &= \frac{2}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j>i}^{n} \alpha(\sigma(Z_i), \sigma(Z_j), \mu) \\
&\leq \frac{2}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j>i}^{n} \alpha(\sigma(Z_1, \ldots, Z_i), \sigma(Z_j, \ldots), \mu) \\
&\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \alpha(\sigma(Z_1, \ldots, Z_i), \sigma(Z_{i+k}, \ldots), \mu) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \alpha(\sigma(Z_1, \ldots, Z_i), \sigma(Z_{i+k}, \ldots), \mu),\ i \in \mathbb{N} \\
&\longrightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the process is weakly α-bi-mixing, see Definition 5. Due to the strong stationarity the process $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is additionally asymptotically mean stationary, that is $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_\mu I_B \circ Z_i = P(B)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{A}$ for a probability measure P. Therefore the process satisfies the WLLNE, see Steinwart et al. (2009, Proposition 3.2) and hence is a weak Varadarajan process, see Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Theorem 2).

Due to the assumptions on the sequence of estimators $(S_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and on the process to be a Varadarajan process we get the qualitative robustness of $(S_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, see Strohriegl and Hable (2016, Theorem 1). Together with the equivalence between the Prokhorov metric d_{Pro} and the bounded Lipschitz metric d_{BL} for Polish spaces, see Huber (1981, Corollary 4.3), it follows:

for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is δ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $Q_n \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^n)$ we have:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) < \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3},$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E} d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \tag{26}$$

Hence part II is done.

For part I define the random variables
$\mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{Z}^n,\ \mathbf{W}_n = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ and $\mathbf{W}_n^* : \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{Z}^n,\ \mathbf{W}_n^* = (Z_1^*, \ldots, Z_n^*)$ with joint distribution $K^{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$ and marginal distributions $K^{\mathbb{N}}(B_1 \times \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}) = P_{\mathbb{N}}(B_1)$ for all $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}$ and $K^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \times B_2) = P_{\mathbb{N}}^*(B_2)$ for all $B_2 \in \mathcal{B}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}$. That is, $\mathbf{W}_n$ has distribution $\mathbf{W}_n \circ K^{\mathbb{N}} = P_n$ and $\mathbf{W}_n^*$ has distribution $\mathbf{W}_n^* \circ K^{\mathbb{N}} = P_n^*$.

Then,

$$\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n) = S_n(P_n) = S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n(P_{\mathbb{N}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n) = S_n(P_n^*) = S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n^*(P_{\mathbb{N}}^*)$$

and therefore

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n)) = d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(S_n \circ W_n^*), \mathcal{L}(S_n \circ W_n)).$$

Regard the process $G_n(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq t\}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq t\}}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Due to the assumptions on the process and on the moving block bootstrap, Theorem 2.3 in Peligrad (1998) yields the almost sure convergence in distribution to a Brownian bridge $G(t)$:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq t\}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq t\}} \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{D}} G(t) \tag{27}$$

almost surely with respect to $(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ in the Skorohod topology on $D[0,1]$. Here $\longrightarrow_{\mathcal{D}}$ indicates convergence in distribution and $D[0,1]$ denotes the space of cadlag functions on $[0,1]$, see for example Billingsley (2013, p. 121).

Multiplying by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ yields for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq t\}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq t\}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} G(t) \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{D}} 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

As convergence in distribution to a constant implies convergence in probability, see for example van der Vaart (1998, Theorem 2.7(iii)) and as $P - \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} G(t) = 0$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq t\}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq t\}} \longrightarrow_P 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

in the Skorohod topology on $D[0,1]$, where $\longrightarrow_P$ denotes the convergence in probability.

This is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq t\}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq t\}} \longrightarrow_P 0 \text{ almost surely,}$$

for all continuity points of $G(t)$, see Billingsley (2013, Equation 12.14, p. 124). Hence, Dudley (1989, Theorem 11.12) yields the convergence of the corresponding probability measures:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i^*}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i} \right) \longrightarrow_P 0 \text{ almost surely,}$$

respectively

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}) \longrightarrow_P 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

Define the set $B_n = \left\{\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) \longrightarrow_P 0\right\}$. Hence, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$P_n(B_n) = P_{\mathbb{N}}(\mathbf{W}_n(\mathbf{w}_{\mathbb{N}}) \in B_n) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \tag{28}$$

and for all $\mathbf{w}_n \in B_n$:

$$P_n^*\left(\mathbf{w}_n^* \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}\right) \leq \delta_0\right) = 1. \tag{29}$$

Due to the uniform continuity of the operator S, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z})$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P, Q) \leq \delta_0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_H(S(P), S(Q)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Hence, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $n \geq n_1$ and for all $\mathbf{w}_n \in B_n$,

$$P_n^*\left(\mathbf{w}_n^* \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H\left(S\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}\right), S\left(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}\right)\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\right) = 1.$$

With Dudley (1989, Theorem 11.3.5) we conclude for the Prokhorov metric d_{Pro}:

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n)) \; &= d_{\mathrm{Pro}}(S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n^*, S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n) \\
&\leq \inf\left\{\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0 \mid K^{\mathbb{N}}\left(d_H(S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n^*, S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n) > \tilde{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\right\} \\
&= \inf\left\{\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0 \mid (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S_n(\mathbf{w}_n^*), S_n(\mathbf{w}_n)) > \tilde{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to the definition of the statistical operator S, this is equivalent to

$$\inf\{\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0 \mid (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}), S(\mathbb{P}_{(\mathbf{w}_n)})) > \tilde{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}\}.$$

Due to the continuity of S, for all $n \geq n_1$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_H(S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}), S(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n})) > \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\right) \\
&\leq (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) > \delta_0\right) \\
&= (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid \mathbf{w}_n \notin B_n,\ d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) > \delta_0\right. \\
&\quad \left. \text{or } \mathbf{w}_n \in B_n,\ d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) > \delta_0\right) \\
&\leq (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid \mathbf{w}_n \notin B_n,\ d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) > \delta_0\right) \\
&\quad + (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid \mathbf{w}_n \in B_n,\ d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) > \delta_0\right) \\
&\overset{(29)}{=} (\mathbf{W}_n^*, \mathbf{W}_n)(K^{\mathbb{N}})\left((\mathbf{w}_n, \mathbf{w}_n^*) \in \mathcal{Z}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \mid \mathbf{w}_n \notin B_n,\ d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}_n}) > \delta_0\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_n\left(\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathcal{Z}^n \mid \mathbf{w}_n \notin B_n\right) \\
&\overset{(28)}{<} \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

The equivalence between Prokhorov metric and bounded Lipschitz metric then yields, for every $n \geq \tilde{n}_1$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}((\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

And therefore

$$\mathbb{E} d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n)\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \tag{30}$$

For part III the same argumentation as for part I holds, as the assumptions on the second process $(\tilde{Z}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ are the same. In particular for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\tilde{n}_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq \tilde{n}_2$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n)\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3},$$

respectively

$$\mathbb{E}d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n)\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \tag{31}$$

Hence, (26), (30) and (31) yield for all $n \geq \max\{\tilde{n}_1, \tilde{n}_2\}$

$$\mathbb{E}d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} = \varepsilon.$$

And as $\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)$ are random variables itself we have, due to Huber (1981, Theorem 4.2) for all $n \geq \max\{n_1, n_2\}$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))\right) < \varepsilon.$$

Hence, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that there is $n_0 = \max\{n_1, n_2\} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $n \geq n_0$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) < \delta \;\Rightarrow\; d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))) < \varepsilon$$

and therefore the assertion. □

Proof of Theorem 2.9:

The proof follows the same lines as the proof of 2.7 and therefore we only state the different steps. Again we start with the triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)) \\ &\leq \underbrace{d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n))}_{I} + \underbrace{d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n))}_{II} + \underbrace{d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))}_{III}. \end{aligned}$$

To proof part II we the need the Varadarajan property of the stochastic process. Due to the definition $\alpha(\sigma(Z_1, \ldots, Z_i), \sigma(Z_{i+k}, \ldots), \mu) \leq 2$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and therefore

$$\alpha(\sigma(Z_1, \ldots, Z_i), \sigma(Z_{i+k}, \ldots), \mu) \leq k + 1,\ k > 0. \tag{32}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\alpha(\sigma(Z_i),\sigma(Z_j),\mu) = \frac{2}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j>i}^{n}\alpha(\sigma(Z_i),\sigma(Z_j),\mu)\\
&\leq \frac{2}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j>i}^{n}\alpha(\sigma(Z_1,\ldots,Z_i),\sigma(Z_j,\ldots),\mu)\\
&\leq \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\alpha(\sigma(Z_1,\ldots,Z_i),\sigma(Z_{i+k},\ldots),\mu)\\
&\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\alpha(\sigma(Z_1,\ldots,Z_i),\sigma(Z_{i+k},\ldots),\mu),\ i\in\mathbb{N}\\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\left(\alpha(\sigma(Z_1,\ldots,Z_i),\sigma(Z_{i+k},\ldots),\mu)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\alpha(\sigma(Z_1,\ldots,Z_i),\sigma(Z_{i+k},\ldots),\mu)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},\ i\in\mathbb{N}\\
&\overset{(32)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(k+1)\left(\alpha(\sigma(Z_1,\ldots,Z_i),\sigma(Z_{i+k},\ldots),\mu)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},\ i\in\mathbb{N}\\
&\xrightarrow{(8)} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the same argumentation as in the proof of 2.7 yields the Varadarajan property and therefore:

$$\mathbb{E}d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n),\mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \tag{33}$$

Hence part II is done.

For part I another CLT for the bootstrapped empirical process, by Bühlmann (1994) is used. Again define the random variables
$\mathbf{W}_n : \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{Z}^n$, $\mathbf{W}_n = (Z_1,\ldots,Z_n)$ and $\mathbf{W}_n^* : \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathcal{Z}^n$, $\mathbf{W}_n^* = (Z_1^*,\ldots,Z_n^*)$ with joint distribution $K^{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$ and marginal distributions $K^{\mathbb{N}}(B_1 \times \mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}) = P_{\mathbb{N}}(B_1)$ for all $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}$ and $K^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}} \times B_2) = P_{\mathbb{N}}^*(B_2)$ for all $B_2 \in \mathcal{B}^{\otimes\mathbb{N}}$. That is, $\mathbf{W}_n$ has distribution $\mathbf{W}_n \circ K^{\mathbb{N}} = P_n$ and $\mathbf{W}_n^*$ has distribution $\mathbf{W}_n^* \circ K^{\mathbb{N}} = P_n^*$.

Then,

$$\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n) = S_n(P_n) = S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n(P_{\mathbb{N}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n) = S_n(P_n^*) = S_n \circ \mathbf{W}_n^*(P_{\mathbb{N}}^*)$$

and therefore

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n),\mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n)) = d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(S_n \circ W_n^*),\mathcal{L}(S_n \circ W_n)).$$

Now, regard the empirical process for $Z_1,\ldots,Z_n$. Set $\mathbf{0} = (0,\ldots,0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{t} = (t_1,\ldots,t_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover $\mathbf{t} < \mathbf{b}$ means $t_i < b_i$ for all $i \in \{1,\ldots,d\}$. Hence we can define the empirical process and the bootstrapped empirical process by

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I_{\{Z_i \leq \mathbf{t}\}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I_{\{Z_i^* \leq \mathbf{t}\}}.$$

Regard the process $G_n(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq \mathbf{t}\}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq \mathbf{t}\}}$, $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Now, due to the assumptions on the process and on the moving block bootstrap, Bühlmann (1994, Corollary 1 and remark) yields the almost sure convergence in distribution to a Gaussian process $G(\mathbf{t})$:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq \mathbf{t}\}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq \mathbf{t}\}} \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{D}} G(\mathbf{t}) \tag{34}$$

almost surely with respect to $(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n)$ in the Skorohod topology on $D^d(\mathbb{R})$. Here $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{D}}$ indicates convergence in distribution and $D^d(\mathbb{R})$ denotes the space of d-dimensional cadlag functions on $\mathbb{R}$. Multiplying by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ yields, for every fixed $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq \mathbf{t}\}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq \mathbf{t}\}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} G(\mathbf{t}) \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{D}} 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

As convergence in distribution to a constant implies convergence in probability, see for example van der Vaart (1998, Theorem 2.7(iii)) and as $P - \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} G(\mathbf{t}) = 0$, for all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq \mathbf{t}\}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq \mathbf{t}\}} \longrightarrow_P 0 \text{ almost surely}$$

in the Skorohod topology on $D^d(\mathbb{R})$, where $\longrightarrow_P$ denotes the convergence in probability.

This equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i^* \leq \mathbf{t}\}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{\{Z_i \leq \mathbf{t}\}} \longrightarrow_P 0 \text{ almost surely}$$

for all continuity points of $G(\mathbf{t})$, see Billingsley (2013, Equation 12.14, p 124). This yields the convergence of the corresponding probability measures, see for example Billingsley (2008, chapter 29):

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i^*}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i}) \longrightarrow_P 0 \text{ almost surely,}$$

respectively

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n^*}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{W}_n}) \longrightarrow_P 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

Now similar to the proof of Theorem 2.7 we obtain: for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_1$

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}} \left(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n) \right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3},$$

respectively,

$$\mathbb{E} d_{\mathrm{BL}} \left(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{P_n}(S_n) \right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \tag{35}$$

Part III follows simultaneously to part I, for the processes $(\tilde{Z}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ instead of $(Z_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\tilde{Z}_i^*)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ instead of $(Z_i^*)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. Hence, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_2$

$$\mathbb{E} d_{\mathrm{BL}} \left(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q_n}(S_n) \right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \tag{36}$$

Hence, (35), (33) and (36) yield for all $n \geq \max\{n_1, n_2\}$

$$\mathbb{E}d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n), \mathcal{L}_{Q^*}(S_n)\right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} = \varepsilon.$$

And as $\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n)$ are random variables itself we have, due to Huber (1981, theorem 4.2) for all $n \geq \max\{n_1, n_2\}$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}\left(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))\right) < \varepsilon.$$

Hence, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that there is $n_0 = \max\{n_1, n_2\} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $n \geq n_0$:

$$d_{\mathrm{BL}}(P_n, Q_n) < \delta \;\Rightarrow\; d_{\mathrm{BL}}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{P_n^*}(S_n)), \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^*}(S_n))) < \varepsilon$$

and therefore the assertion. □

References

P. Billingsley. *Probability and measure*. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.

G. Boente, R. Fraiman, and V. J. Yohai. Qualitative robustness for stochastic processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 15(3):1293–1312, 1987.

R. C. Bradley. Basic properties of strong mixing conditions. A survey and some open questions. *Probab. Surv.*, 2:107–144, 2005.

P. Bühlmann. Blockwise bootstrapped empirical process for stationary sequences. *Ann. Statist.*, 22(2):995–1012, 1994.

P. Bühlmann. The blockwise bootstrap for general empirical processes of stationary sequences. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 58(2):247–265, 1995.

O. Bustos. On qualitative robustness for general processes. unpublished manuscriped, 1980.

A. Christmann, M. Salibián-Barrera, and S. Van Aelst. Qualitative robustness of bootstrap approximations for kernel based methods. In *Robustness and complex data structures*, pages 263–278. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.

D. D. Cox. metrics on stochastic processes and qualitative robustness. Technical report, Department of Statistics, University of Washington, 1981.

A. Cuevas and J. Romo. On robustness properties of bootstrap approximations. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 37(2):181–191, 1993.

Z. Denkowski, S. Migórski, and N. S. Papageorgiou. *An introduction to nonlinear analysis: applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA, 2003.

P. Doukhan. *Mixing*. Springer, New York, 1994.

R. M. Dudley. *Real Analysis and Probability*. Chapman&Hall, New York, 1989.

R. M. Dudley. *Uniform central limit theorems*, volume 63 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.

R. M. Dudley, E. Giné, and J. Zinn. Uniform and universal Glivenko-Cantelli classes. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 4(3):485–510, 1991.

B. Efron. Bootstrap methods: another look at the jackknife. *Ann. Statist.*, 7(1):1–26, 1979.

B. Efron and R. J. Tibshirani. *An introduction to the bootstrap*, volume 57 of *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*. Chapman and Hall, New York, 1993.

R. Hable and A. Christmann. On qualitative robustness of support vector machines. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 102:993–1007, 2011.

F. R. Hampel. *Contributions to the theory of robust estimation*. PhD thesis, Univ. California, Berkeley, 1968.

F. R. Hampel. A general qualitative definition of robustness. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 42:1887–1896, 1971.

J. Hoffmann-Jørgensen. *Probability with a view toward statistics. Vol. I*. Chapman & Hall Probability Series. Chapman & Hall, New York, 1994.

P. J. Huber. *Robust statistics*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1981. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.

J. Jurečková and J. Picek. *Robust statistical methods with R*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2006.

H. R. Künsch. The jackknife and the bootstrap for general stationary observations. *Ann. Statist.*, 17(3):1217–1241, 1989.

S. N. Lahiri. *Resampling methods for dependent data*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.

R. Y. Liu and K. Singh. Moving blocks jackknife and bootstrap capture weak dependence. In *Exploring the limits of bootstrap (East Lansing, MI, 1990)*, Wiley Ser. Probab. Math. Statist. Probab. Math. Statist., pages 225–248. Wiley, New York, 1992.

R. A. Maronna, R. D. Martin, and V. J. Yohai. *Robust statistics*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 2006. Theory and methods.

U. V. Naik-Nimbalkar and M. B. Rajarshi. Validity of blockwise bootstrap for empirical processes with stationary observations. *Ann. Statist.*, 22(2):980–994, 1994.

P. Papantoni-Kazakos and R. M. Gray. Robustness of estimators on stationary observations. *The Annals of Probability*, 7(6):989–1002, 1979.

K. R. Parthasarathy. *Probability measures on metric spaces*, volume 352. American Mathematical Soc., 1967.

M. Peligrad. On the blockwise bootstrap for empirical processes for stationary sequences. *Ann. Probab.*, 26(2):877–901, 1998.

D. N. Politis and J. P. Romano. A circular block-resampling procedure for stationary data. In *Exploring the limits of bootstrap (East Lansing, MI, 1990)*, Wiley Ser. Probab. Math. Statist. Probab. Math. Statist., pages 263–270. 1990.

D. Radulović. The bootstrap for empirical processes based on stationary observations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 65, 1996.

B. Schölkopf and A. J. Smola. *Learning with Kernels*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, 2002.

Q. M. Shao and H. Yu. Bootstrapping the sample means for stationary mixing sequences. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 48(1):175–190, 1993.

K. Singh. On the asymptotic accuracy of Efron's bootstrap. *Ann. Statist.*, 9(6):1187–1195, 1981.

I. Steinwart and A. Christmann. *Support vector machines*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer, New York, 2008.

I. Steinwart, D. Hush, and C. Scovel. Learning from dependent observations. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 100:175–194, 2009.

K. Strohriegl and R. Hable. On qualitative robustness for stochastic processes. *Metrika*, 2016. doi: 10.1007/s00184-016-0582-z.

A. W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

H. Zähle. Qualitative robustness of von Mises statistics based on strongly mixing data. *Statistical Papers*, 55:157–167, 2014.